



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.           | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/525,229  | 10/12/2005  | Oliver Feilen        | 8369.005.US0000               | 7192                   |
| 77176   | 7590        | 03/01/2010           |                               |                        |
| Novak, Druce & Quigg LLP<br>1300 I Street, N.W.<br>Suite 1000, West Tower<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>TRAORE, FATOUMATA |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2436              | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>03/01/2010       | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b><br/><b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p> | <p><b>Application No.</b><br/>10/525,229</p> | <p><b>Applicant(s)</b><br/>FEILEN ET AL.</p> |  |
|  | <p><b>Examiner</b><br/>FATOUMATA TRAORE</p>  | <p><b>Art Unit</b><br/>2436</p>              |  |

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 04 February 2010. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 12-19.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Nasser Moazzami/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguees' Schwartz provides a system where a drive device may not be removed .....he memory module is functional in operating a control device of a component of a motor vehicle is clearly in error. The examiner respectfully disagrrres and submits that the combined teaching of Schwartz and pelier discloses every elements of the claims as presented. he examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's characterization of the prior of record and Submits that Schwartz discloses the step of, the reading and storing of such an identifier in a memory module of an electronic operating system of a vehicle and comparing such stored identifier with an identifier of a replacement module to determine the suitability of the replacement module( see paragraphs {0014}, [0017]-[0018]) described initially storing identifier 46 ( in memory 42. During the attempted boot of hard drive 16, processor 22 polls hard drive 16(component) and retrieves identifier 44 from hard drive 16 and compares identifier 44 with identifier 46 stored in memory 42. If identifiers 44 and 46 match, hard drive 16 is booted. Additionally, processor 22 may be adapted to generate an alert on a display or other type of output device (not explicitly shown) indicating that identifiers 44 and 46 do not correspond with each other. Accordingly, the configuration of system 10 remains secure because drive device 15 may not be removed and replaced with another drive device--any serial number or identifier of the replacement drive device will not match identifier 46 stored in memory 42. which meet the limitations of claimed invention. Peltier was used to show that the memory module is functional in operating a control device of a component of a motor vehicle(see column 4, lines 18-30) as previously discloses by the examiner..